

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-20 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basu (USP no. 6,219,640) in view of Nevenka (USPPA 2003/0108334).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims. However, the independent claims have been amended to further recite that the video features are selected from temporal and spatial domains (see page, lines 9-15) and that the correlation values are determined as the sum of correlation values between the selected audio features and selected video features (see page 12, lines 4-13 and page 13, lines 9-25).

The claims, as amended more clearly recite determining a video/audio match based on the correlation processing of individual features.

Basu describes a method and apparatus for performing speaker recognition comprising processing a video signal and an audio signal using a score combination approach, a feature combination approach and a re-scoring approach. In one aspect Basu teaches that "the top three scores from the face identification process may be combined with the top three scores from the acoustic speaker identification process. Then the highest combined score is identified to the speaker." (see col. 10, lines 7-11). Basu, in this aspect, referred to as fusion approach (see col. 12, lines 19-20) teaches processing the video features separately from the audio features and then processing the top three scores of each of these identified video and audio aspects.

In another aspect, referred to as feature fusion approach (see col. 12, lines 21-22) Basu teaches that a combined AV feature vector is determined combining acoustic features and visual features. Basu teaches that linear interpolation from frames immediately preceding and following the time instant can be used (see col. 12, lines 33-48).

Basu fails to suggest or describe determining "a maximum correlation value, wherein each of said correlation values is determined as the sum of the correlation values of the selected elements of said audio features, and a selected one of the object features,"

as is recited in the claims. Basu does not teach or suggest determining the AV vector as that vector having a maximum correlation value wherein the correlation values are determined from a subset of the audio and video features.

Nevenka is recited, in part, to show that audio elements may be composed of low level elements of bandwidth, energy and pitch. However, Nevenka fails to teach or suggest that a correlation values are determined from selected audio features and each of the video features or that a sum of the correlation values associated with each video feature is used to determine a maximum correlation value.

A claimed invention is prima facie obvious when three basic criteria are met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the teachings therein. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. And, third, the prior art reference or combined references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The combination of the teachings of Basu and Navenda does not render obvious the invention, recited in claim 1, for example, as the combined device fails to recite all the elements claims.

For at least this reason, applicant submits that the reason for the rejections of claim 1 has been overcome and the rejection can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

The remaining independent claims recite subject matter similar to that recited in claim 1. Thus, for the amendments made to the claims and applicant's remarks made in response to the rejection of claim 1, applicant submits the rejection of these claims has been overcome. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

The remaining dependent claims ultimately depend from the independent claims, and hence are allowable over the cited references by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basu in view of Nevenka and further in view of Bradford (USPPA 2002/0103799). Claims 9-10,

12-14 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basu in view of Nevenka and further in view of Wang (Multimedia Content Analysis).


Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the aforementioned claims. These claims depend from the independent claims, which have been shown to contain subject matter not disclosed by the combination of Basu and Nevenda. The additionally cited references fail to provide any teaching or suggestion to correct the deficiency noted in the combination of the primary references. Hence, even if there were some motivation to combine the teachings of all of the cited references, the device so created fails to teach all the features recited in the independent claims, and consequently, the aforementioned dependent claims.

Accordingly, the invention recited in the aforementioned claims is not rendered obvious by the teachings of the cited references. For at least this reason applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski  
Registration No. 42,079

  
By: Steve Cha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069

Date: January 11, 2007

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615